

:

REMARKS

Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the application, as amended, in view of the following remarks.

The present invention as set forth in **Claim 1** relates to a flame-retardant curable resin composition which comprises (1) a polymerizable vinyl monomer having a glass transition temperature of its homopolymer of at most 0°C, (2) a polymerization initiator, (3) a reducing agent and (4) a flame retardant in an amount of from 25 to 75 parts by mass based on 100 parts by mass of the total of (1) the polymerizable vinyl monomer having a glass transition temperature of its homopolymer of at most 0°C, (2) the polymerization initiator and (3) the reducing agent.

In contrast, Taguchi et al and Parsons et al fail to disclose or suggest a flame-retardant curable resin composition comprising a flame retardant in an amount of from 25 to 75 parts by mass. In addition, the attached Rule 132 Declaration shows that superior properties are obtained using the claimed amount of flame retardant. If more than 25 to 75 parts by weight of flame retardant is used (Test No. 2-7), the storage elastic modulus becomes very high (1800), the degree of distortion is too high (9.0) and an apparent warp is observed (evaluation standard "x" as defined at page 19, last line of the specification). If less than 25 to 75 parts by weight of flame retardant is used (Test No. 2-6), the flame retardancy is poor. Thus, the amount of 25 to 75 parts by weight of flame retardant is superior. This is not disclosed or suggested by Taguchi et al and/or Parsons et al.

In addition, new **Claim 8** has been added in which the cured product of said flame-retardant curable resin composition comprises a flame retardant in an amount of from 25 to 75 parts by mass and has a storage elastic modulus of at most 1,500 MPa at a temperature of 23°C. In contrast, Taguchi et al and Parsons et al fail to disclose or suggest a flame-retardant curable resin composition as claimed in new Claim 8. In addition, the attached Rule 132

Application No.: 10/091,422

Reply to the Office Action dated: February 6, 2004

Declaration shows that the storage elastic modulus is too high (1800 for Test No. 2-7) if more than the claimed amount of flame-retardant is used. It is also shown that the storage elastic modulus is not just a property of the monomer but increases with increasing amount of flame retardant.

Therefore, the rejection of Claims 1-7 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over Taguchi et al in view of Parsons et al is believed to be unsustainable as the present invention is neither anticipated nor obvious and withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.


Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner acknowledge that all references cited in the **Information Disclosure Statement**, filed in the above-identified application on **May 29, 2002**, have been considered. Specifically, reference AW was not initialed by the Examiner. For the Examiner's convenience a copy of Form PTO 1449 as filed on **May 29, 2002**, is attached herewith.

This application presents allowable subject matter, and the Examiner is kindly requested to pass it to issue. Should the Examiner have any questions regarding the claims or otherwise wish to discuss this case, he is kindly invited to contact Applicants' below-signed representative, who would be happy to provide any assistance deemed necessary in speeding this application to allowance.

Respectfully submitted,

OBLON, SPIVAK, McCLELLAND,
MAIER & NEUSTADT, P.C.
Norman F. Oblon

Customer Number
22850


Kirsten A. Grueneberg, Ph.D.
Registration No.: 47,297